

REMARKS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the above-mentioned Office Action in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 4-16, and 18-22 remain pending in this application, with Claims 1 and 15 being independent. Claim 11 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1, 2, 4-10, 12-15, and 21 have been amended herein.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 15, 16, 21, and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,151,041 (Bolash et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,155,664 (Cook). Claims 5-14 and 18-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Bolash et al. and Cook and in further view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0174180 (Nunokawa). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

With the present invention, the problem that a printer driver is set in a host without determination of a kind of device can be resolved. Due to the features of the present invention, when the kind of device is not determined, communicating means is prevented from communicating with the information processing apparatus, and a wrong printer driver can be prevented from being installed.

Bolash et al. is directed to an ink jet printer that can install head cartridges of different types. When image data is received, the processor of the ink jet printer can determine the appropriate type of print head cartridge that should be used. The printer processor examines information electronically stored on the mounted print head cartridges to determine if one of the

desired cartridges is mounted. If so, the printer processor configures the printer to print with the desired cartridge. If the printer cannot locate the desired type of print head cartridge, an error message is displayed. However, Bolash et al. does not disclose or suggest at least in response to detection of mounting of a recording head, causing a storing portion to store the kind of device stored in the mounted recording head, discriminating that the kind of device is determined when the storing portions stores the kind of device and determining that the kind of device is not determined when the storing portion does not store the kind of device, as is recited in independent Claims 1 and 15. Nor does Bolash et al. disclose or suggest at least that when the discriminator or discriminating step discriminates that the kind of device is not determined, prohibiting communicating means from communicating with the information processing apparatus, and when discriminating that the kind of device is determined, permitting the communicating means to communicate with the information processing apparatus, as is further recited in independent Claims 1 and 15.

Thus, Bolash et al. fails to disclose or suggest important features of the present invention recited in the independent claims.

The ink jet printer of Cook can determine whether ink within a remote ink cartridge is compatible with ink within a print head cartridge and controlling the printer accordingly. Proper installation of the print head cartridge and the remote ink cartridge can be verified. When an improper installation is determined, a message is generated in order to notify the user of the problem. That is, as understood by Applicant, Cook compares the kind of ink in an ink cartridge adjacent to a head in the ink in a remote ink cartridge, and warns the user if the

result of comparison is negative. Cook, however, does not determine the kind of device of the printer on the basis of the kind of device stored in the print recording head. Nor does Cook disclose or suggest causing a storing portion to store a kind of device stored in a mounted recording head, or discriminating that the kind of device is determined when the storing portion stores the kind of device, while determining that the kind of device is not determined when the storing portion is not stored the kind of device. Cook, therefore, fails to remedy the deficiencies of Bolash et al. noted above with respect to the independent claims.

Nunokawa has also been reviewed but is not believed to remedy the deficiencies of the citations noted above with respect to the independent claims.

Thus, Claims 1 and 15 are patentable over the citations of record.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejections are respectfully requested.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the present invention is patentably defined by independent Claims 1 and 15. Dependent Claims 2, 4-10, 12-14, 16, and 18-22 are also allowable, in their own right, for defining features of the present invention in addition to those recited in their respective independent claims. Individual consideration of the dependent claims is requested.

Applicant submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the above-noted Office Action, and an early Notice of Allowability are requested.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark A. Williamson/

Mark A. Williamson
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 33,628

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200
MAW:yiz

FCIS_WS 2691914v1